



Wartburg Trumpet

Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa 50677

(USPS 6667-4000)

Vol. 87 / No. 7

November 2, 1992



Candidates vie for Wartburg vote



A standing room only crowd in Buhr Lounge welcomed the Rev. Jesse Jackson to Wartburg Wednesday during a campaign tour in support of Rep. Dave Nagle. Here, Dr. Doris Cottam, Jackson and Nagle clasp their hands in unity in Buhr Lounge. Photo by Ryan Gutz.

Wartburg College was the site of much last-minute campaigning by both Democrats and Republicans last week.

The Rev. Jesse Jackson appeared before a capacity crowd Wednesday morning in Buhr Lounge as part of a campaign tour drumming up support for Rep. Dave Nagle.

Jackson had made an earlier stop at the University of Northern Iowa. He was joined by Nagle, Democratic candidate for Iowa's 2nd District Congressional seat, at Wartburg. The two later appeared at Upper Iowa University in Fayette.

Later Wednesday evening, Rep. Jim Nussle and Robert Brunkhorst spoke in Voecks Auditorium. The two were invited by the Young Republicans to offer students a chance to ask them questions concerning their campaigns.

Nussle is Nagle's Republican opponent for the 2nd Congressional District, while Brunkhorst is running against Dr. Doris Cottam for the 22nd District seat in the Iowa House.

Cottam is an associate professor of sociology at Wartburg.



Republican Robert Brunkhorst speaks to students in Voecks Auditorium Wednesday night. Brunkhorst, who is running for the 22nd Iowa House seat, appeared at Wartburg with Rep. Jim Nussle. Photo by Ryan Gutz.



A ROOM DIVIDED—Residents of Clinton Ground North Room 19 are encouraging Wartburg students to exercise their right to vote on Tuesday. The idea came about because two of the three men are members of opposing political parties. As a result, all three decided not to endorse any one candidate. "We aren't supporting a particular candidate so much as trying to get people to vote," Joel Becker, '95, said.

Large Wartburg voter turnout expected

BY STACEY FRAIN

At least 80 percent of students registered to vote on campus will cast ballots this week, according to Andrew Howie, '93, president of Wartburg Young Democrats.

Voting for the general election will be in the P.E. Complex on Tuesday, Nov. 3, from 7 a.m. to 9 p.m.

Howie hopes the turnout this year will be better than that of the 1990 non-presidential election, where 77.8 percent of the students registered on campus voted. Voting for that election took place off campus.

"It's just as easy for students to stop at the P.E. Complex and vote as it is to go to Becker Hall of Science or Engelbrecht

Library [to attend class or study]," said Howie.

More than 500 students registered to vote here because of the club's efforts. In addition, at least 30 percent of the students here will vote on absentee ballots.

According to various voting statistics, only 30 percent of 18-24 year olds vote.

Trumpet/KWAR Telephone Poll

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

Bill Clinton
48%

George Bush
21%

Ross Perot
20%

Undecided
11%

IOWA ERA

Favor
73%

Oppose
20%

Undecided
7%

Based on a survey of more than 100 Wartburg College students likely to vote in Tuesday's election.

Wartburg polling place located in PE Complex

Editorial

Voting taken for granted

Are you going to vote tomorrow?

This is not a difficult question to answer. Either you are or you aren't.

Unfortunately, a majority of Americans probably aren't going to vote on election day. Polls and experts may say otherwise, but when it comes down to it people really don't care.

They hesitate when confronted with a choice of candidates and usually end up not voting at all because "my vote really doesn't make a difference anyway."

But it does.

The Greeks knew the importance of democracy and of voting on issues. True, only citizens—white males—had a voice, but at least these men spoke out. Which is more than can be said about most Americans.

Voting gives us a say in how government is run. It crosses all lines of gender, creed and ethnicity. It is our right. A right that must be exercised lest we lose it due to apathy.

Too often we take such a simple action for granted. Maybe we need to lose suffrage for a while in order to see how it affects each of our lives. Maybe the pigs from George Orwell's "Animal Farm" need to take over the American barnyard before we are motivated to action.

Voting is our voice and our right. Through voting we have a say in how this nation operates. Politicians and other elected officials still make the policies we live by. But the type of politicians who make those policies is decided by us. We vote for the candidate, based on his/her platform, who best represents our needs.

But if we don't vote, how will our needs ever be met?

So we have no right to complain about bombing Middle Eastern nations or about the government's hollow commitment to education.

Unless we vote.

Vote for a brighter future

Students who are registered to vote on campus will have the ability to cast four votes for a brighter future, for a better government and for a better country.

Through all the candidate's hype, the choices are clear and concise—to propel this country out of deadlock and stagnation we must vote for Democrats and "yes" on the Equal Rights Amendment.

George Bush does not deserve re-election due to his failed presidency, while Bill Clinton does deserve to be president in his own right.

Clinton has definitive plans and solutions for the problems that face this country. His economic plan has been recognized by respected economists, including five Nobel Prize winners, as the best plan available to put Americans back to work and this economy back on its feet.

He has not "waffled" as another candidate would like us to believe. Instead, he has steadfastly held true to his belief that this country can get moving forward again through investment in areas such as education, job training and roads.

Only a Democratic president can get a Democratic Congress working again. We need tax cuts—not tax increases, Presidential line-item veto power, spending cuts on domestic and foreign programs and decreased power of PACs and special interest groups. With Clinton in the White House, the government will finally get moving again.

Vote against deadlock and for progress by voting for Bill Clinton for president.

In the race for Iowa's 2nd Congressional District, two

incumbents have been locked in a bitter fight to win the seat. It has been a close battle, but one clearly outshines the other.

Rep. Dave Nagle has done more for his district in the past six years than his predecessors did in the previous 30. He has sponsored

legislation to build roads, create a stronger infrastructure, improve education funding and bring jobs to Iowa.

It would be a tremendous loss to this state if we lost an accomplished leader and representative like Nagle. We should reward Nagle's success in the past with re-election.

Dr. Doris Cottam is by far the best choice for Representative for the Iowa House. Wartburg students have the rare opportunity to send a person to the legislature who has direct ties to this college. Since she is a professor here, she will be in the best position to bring wisdom to our state government about the necessity to provide for our schools and teachers. Wartburg can only gain with Dr. Cottam in the legislature. Vote for Wartburg's benefit, vote for Cottam for Iowa House District 22.

Last, but certainly not least, we must vote for the Equal Rights Amendment. All the mud slinging by the opposition citing a "hidden agenda" advocated by "militant feminist forces" in the state is complete garbage. "Equality" is exactly that, equality. I would like to know where the opposition gets "special privileges for homosexuals, abortionists, witches, etc." out of the words "equality" and "gender". All of their "facts" are based on speculation and hallucination. Women are not second-class citizens, vote for the Equal Rights Amendment.

It's All Too Much

Andrew Howie

Misconceptions cloud ERA

A couple weeks ago the Trumpet ran a full-page story on the Equal Rights Amendment. It is important that our voters be provided with complete, impartial information before casting their ballots.

My concern is about the misinformation that surrounds this issue.

Most people, if questioned, would probably answer that men and women are equal—more or less—in the eyes of the legal system and in legislative decisions. Besides, women already have plenty of laws to protect them, right? They believe this despite the large wage gap and the disparities in economic, educational and career opportunities that still exist.

The right wing still insists upon making ridiculous accusations about future possibilities should the ERA be passed. Somehow the issues of abortion and homosexuality have become hopelessly entangled with the amendment.

These fears are grounded in paranoia, not reality. The proposed changes to the constitution do not include phrases about either issue.

The words "homosexual," "homophile," "sexual or affectional orientation," "gay" or "lesbian" are in no way connected to the amendment. Homophile marriages will not be legalized through the ERA.

I challenge anyone to show me how the amendment will have any effect on the second-class citizen standing of homophiles in our society. None of the 12 states which have passed ERA similar to Iowa's proposed one have become lesbian-run socialist states. Nor do I think that is a very real threat in Iowa.

My Point of View

Dianne Ludwig

As for the abortion issue, conservatives fear that abortion funded by tax dollars would become a guaranteed right. This is nonsense.

Abortion for lower-income women is controlled by Medicaid. In every state except Connecticut,

Medicaid is a privilege, not a right. Since Iowa's proposed ERA does not propose making Medicaid a right, it would not change the status of abortion.

There is one last point that I feel the need to address. A friend raised the objection that passing the ERA would heavily burden the legal system with additional cases.

There may be an increase in cases of sex discrimination until businesses and other institutions get the message that women can no longer be treated as less-than-human. But things will change of their own accord as these institutions will want to avoid expensive, embarrassing court cases.

Come election day, I will be voting for the ERA. But I cannot, and should not, tell you how to vote.

Just take this advice: Be informed. Talk to people and find out the facts. Don't vote against the ERA because you've fallen victim to irrational fear tactics, prejudice and sexism.

When you step into the voting booth on Tuesday and pull the lever, the curtain will close behind you and you will be all alone.

The choice is yours, but the effects will be felt for years to come by you, your family and perhaps your children.

Don't go in blind.

Student offers voting guidelines

For the past few months, I've looked over the candidates' views on several issues, studied their character, intelligence and past experiences. I've listened to professors, journalists, friends, foes and family. Still, I'm unsure of who to vote for.

Below are four guidelines to help those individuals like myself who are still undecided.

1. Realize that a vote is an expression, not just a number. Don't be influenced by individuals who view your vote as a "wasted" one. When giving into this criticism, you're agreeing that your opinion doesn't matter. Just because your candidate may not win doesn't mean you haven't won.

2. Be knowledgeable of the candidates. I'm not implying that we all need to be "textbook" voters. We each must give ourselves an honest critique and personally decide if we're able to cast a valid vote.

3. Think "team." Don't vote for your personal goals. Choose a candidate which will help us all, not just certain

groups.

Look to the candidate who will give you a chance to partake in our country's repair. It is unfair and inhuman to want certain individuals to take on our many problems while others do not. We should all want to

join and succeed in rebuilding our home.

4. Go with your gut reaction! We are all born with a basic emotion called an instinct. In many times of uncertainty, your instinct produces a natural, comfortable and honest solution. So use it!

To those of you who feel this is an unintellectual means of decision-making, you're right. But tell me how else does one make sense of political campaigns? How are the truths deciphered from the fallacies or the images from the realities? Overall, how can one judge properly without using their own instincts?

I hope these guidelines help in your decision. If you vote "for" and not "against" a candidate, control your selfishness, inform yourself to your approval, listen to your instinct and you'll have no regrets.

The Dotterer Line

Anthony Dotterer

Wartburg Trumpet

Editor
Managing Editor
News Editor
Sports Editor
Arts and Entertainment Editor
Features Editor
Typesetter
Columnist
Columnist
Photographer
Photographer
Business Manager
Ad Salesperson
Ad Salesperson
Ad Salesperson
Ad Salesperson
Graphic Design
Circulation Manager
Adviser

Paul Everding
Christopher Warmanen
Nicole Johanninger
Tim Seeger
Chris Lenning
Brad Waller
Andrew Arnold
Andy Holtz
Andrew Howie
Ryan Gutz
Joel Becker
Scott Glaser
Lillian Johnson
Benny Benjamin
Lance Larson
Charles Trunck
Jill Lafferty
Valerie Foreman
Robert Gremmels

Contributing Writers

Michael Waugh, Pam Myers, Brian Fiser, Jennifer Heaney, Stephanie Frame, Bradley Wood, Jenny Wee, Joel Becker, Stacey Frain, Bob McBride, Anna Strom, Kristin Drackley, Angie Wilgus, Diane Neuzil, Jennifer Block, Dana Scharnhorst, Mike Evans, Brian Fiser, Pam Myers, Nathan Hill

Published weekly during the school year by the students of Wartburg College, Waverly, IA, 50677. Offices located in McElroy Communication Arts Center, (319) 352-8289. Mail subscription rate: \$18 annually. Second-class postage paid at Waverly, IA, 50677. Views expressed are those of the editorial board and not necessarily those of the administration, faculty, or staff of Wartburg College. Founded in 1906 as the Wartburg Quarterly.

Much ado about dueling

When I was reading the sample ballot printed in our local newspaper, I came across the second amendment change to the constitution. It read "The proposed change repeals Section 5, Article I of the Constitution of the State of Iowa, which forever bars parties to a duel from holding public office."

The first time I read this statement, I had no idea what it was talking about. Duel? Isn't that where you walk ten paces and shoot? I was confused and decided to learn more so I could be an informed voter.

The amendment was added to the constitution in 1857, when dueling was an actual way of solving disputes. It served its purpose, and now lawmakers feel that it should be removed from the constitution.

End of story, right? Wrong.
When this issue came up in the Iowa House

Knock on Wood
Bradley Wood

and Senate, some legislators felt that it should be left in the constitution, as a reminder of our history. Dueling is not a big problem in society today, and no harm would come from leaving this amendment in

the constitution. Other legislators feel that there are other ways to preserve our heritage than by leaving this amendment in the constitution. Copies of the old constitution will still be around, they argue. The Iowa Constitution deserves to be kept current to deal with the problems of the day.

I haven't decided how to vote on this issue, but at least I know what "parties to a duel" means and can make an informed decision.

This change to the constitution may not be as important as who our next president is, or whether the Equal Rights Amendment gets passed, but it is an important part of our history.

Abortion argument against ERA

This election year Iowans will vote on the Equal Rights Amendment. We earnestly believe that women should receive equal pay for performing similar jobs, which is already covered by an existing law, Iowa Code 79.18.

There are other implications to the ERA which should also be considered. The implication we wish to discuss deals with tax-funded abortions.

The Superior Court of Connecticut used the Connecticut state ERA to require tax funding of abortions. They ruled in Doe vs. Maher, April 9, 1986, that "...since only women become pregnant, discrimination against pregnancy by not funding abortions...is sex-oriented discrimination... The court concludes that the regulation that restricts the funding for abortions...violates Connecticut's Equal Rights Amendment."

This appears to be a goal of the Iowa ERA as well. The Iowa Legislature offered an amendment to make the ERA "abortion neutral." This amendment was defeated, clearly indicating that the Iowa ERA is designed to give the courts a "blank check" to force Iowa taxpayers to pay for abortions. Thus, the ERA would insult those who see abortion as being immoral by forcing us to pay for them.

We would hope that dialogue on the controversial abortion issue could be discussed as such, instead of having the decision made as a part of the "hidden agenda" of the ERA.

It is on this basis that we urge Iowans to vote "no" on the Equal Rights Amendment.

James Wienke, '93
David Black, '93

'Year of the Woman' a fallacy

This is the "Year of the Woman." I have no problems with equality, in fact as humans we are equal. But what is the "Year of the Woman"?

Frankly, this does not sound like "equality," but mere gender discrimination. How can this be the year of the woman, when in 1990 more women ran for office than are running this year?

I am tired of hearing about this discriminatory phenomenal occurrence. Is it possible to have an

election year where candidates focus on the actual issues rather than be concerned only with the media hype?

I am a woman who chooses to vote for candidates based on their platform and their integrity. Remember: This election is about solutions, not labels.

Kara L. Jund, '94

Voting requires good judgment

Guest Column
Michael Evans

Can there be too much democracy in a country? After voting for the first time, I think so.

It all started last Tuesday. I made my way down to the Johnson County Courthouse to vote but I wasn't prepared for what happened.

Who do you want as president was the first question. After that I lost interest and started asking different questions about voting in general.

The U.S. Senate seat was an easy choice for me once I decided I couldn't vote for a guy named Stu who rides around in a bus painted with rainbows.

The U.S. House seat was also an easy decision. Jim Leach vs. a Democrat even the Des Moines Register didn't like.

Voting on the first amendment to the Iowa Constitution was easy enough. It was the second amendment that lost me. I read it three times and still had no idea what it was talking about.

The rest of the questions became increasingly boring. For state representatives, I voted for

the incumbents. If they were doing a bad job, they'd be running for president.

After that I lost all interest.

The next set of questions involved various committee appointments. I was given two candidate choices and told to choose two.

Why waste trees printing dumb questions like this these?

The last segment was pointless. I got to choose which judges should be retained.

Unless one of the judges was David Duke or Pat Robertson, I really didn't care. Even if I did care, I wouldn't have known enough to vote for one of them. I have no idea who is a good judge in Iowa.

It's nice they give us the power to choose our judges, but no thank you. I would feel bad if a good judge was fired because I didn't care if they were retained or not.

More voting power isn't always good. Sometimes, decisions are better left to people with knowledge on the subject.

Libertarian perspective

The idea that you can pick a winner with your vote in the presidential election is silly. You have a greater chance of dying in a car wreck on your way to the polls than you do of affecting the outcome of the race with your vote. It's tempting not to vote at all, but that sends the message that you just don't care.

The only sensible reason to vote is to express your values. A vote for a candidate says, "This person best represents the ideas I think are right. This is the direction I want the country to go."

If you really want four more years of George Bush's approach to running our country, vote for him. If you really like Bill Clinton's push for more government programs (and more taxes), vote for him. If you really want Ross Perot to impose even higher taxes and control over people's lives, vote for him.

But if, like us, you support personal, economic and social liberty and real reductions in taxes and government spending, vote Libertarian.

Libertarian presidential candidate Andre Marrou and his running mate Nancy Lord are on the ballot in all 50 states. They can't spend millions of tax dollars to fund their campaign, like George Bush and Bill Clinton. And they don't have millions of their own to spend, like Ross Perot.

But they do have the best ideas going. Check them out. Your vote is your voice—use it effectively. If we keep voting for what we don't really want, we'll certainly keep getting it.

Sylvia and Ben Olson
Pocahontas

Now is the time for all good people
to come to the aid of their party!

VOTE

on Tuesday, Nov. 3

**Before you're alone in the dark
with someone you love ... see us.**

Be sure you're protected against unwanted pregnancy and sexually-transmitted disease. Planned Parenthood is here to help. With caring, professional, and totally confidential services ... a sliding fee scale that makes reproductive health care affordable ... and a comfortable clinic. Call for an appointment today.

**Planned Parenthood®
of Greater Iowa**

2520 Melrose Drive, Suite D, Cedar Falls 277-3333

Serving
Black Hawk
County
Since 1934

FREE TRAVEL AND
RESUME EXPERIENCE!!
Individuals and student
organizations wanted to
promote SPRING BREAK,
call the nation's leader.
Inter-Campus programs. 1-
800-327-6013.



- Vote Brunkhorst for House Nov. 3.
- Bob insists the Iowa Tuition Grant won't be cut.
- Bob will work for deficit control, education, environment, and jobs for our generations.

Bob listens to students' concerns.

Paid for by Brunkhorst for House

STATE OF IOWA JUDICIAL BALLOT
NOVEMBER 3, 1992

NOTICE TO VOTERS: The log of this ballot... Shall the following judges be retained in office?

OFFICES	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
SUPREME COURT JAMES H. CARTER	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
DISTRICT COURT STEPHEN P. CARROLL																							
DISTRICT COURT JOHN S. MACKAY																							
DISTRICT COURT PAUL W. RUFEL																							
DISTRICT ASSOCIATE JUDGE CARLYNN D. GRUFF																							
United States Senator (Vote for No More Than One)																							
United States Representative (2nd District) (Vote for One)																							
State Representative (2nd District) (Vote for One)																							
Board of Supervisors (1st District) (Vote for One)																							
County Auditor (Vote for One)																							
County Sheriff (Vote for One)																							
Regional Library Trustee (Vote for One)																							
Soil and Water Conservation District Commissioner (Vote for No More Than Two)																							
Agricultural Extension Council (Vote for No More Than Four)																							
Republican																							
Democratic																							
Nominated by Petition																							
Grassroots Party																							
Libertarian Party of Iowa																							
America First Party																							
Socialist Workers Party																							
Taxpayers Party																							
New Alliance Party																							
Independents for Economic Recovery																							
Campaign for a New Tomorrow																							
Natural Law Party of Iowa																							
Write-In																							

General Election, Bremer County, Iowa, Nov. 3, 1992

INSTRUCTIONS FOR VOTING: Mark a cross (X) or check mark (✓) in the circle at left end of ballot if you wish to vote a straight party ticket, or make a similar mark in the square above the name for whom you wish to vote.

Kathy Q. Thoma
County Commissioner of Elections